
K

DRY VS. WET AD LIBITUM FEEDING OF FINISHING SWINE

S

Robert H. Hines and J. Vargas Vargas

U

Summary

Two hundred finishing pigs were used to evaluate wet vs. dry ad libitum feeding. Growth rate of finishing pigs was significantly improved (5%) by wet feeding. Feed utilization was improved 4.5% by wet feeding. Dry feeder type did not influence performance, since all pigs fed dry diets performed similarly. Likewise, pigs fed wet diets performed equally regardless of wet feeder type.

Introduction

Two feeding trials were reported in the 1984 Swine Day publication evaluating feeding systems for finishing swine. In those trials, a 5% improvement was observed in growth rate of wet-fed pigs as compared to pigs fed dry diets either as meals or ad libitum. The purpose of this trial was to evaluate ad libitum feeding in two types of dry and two types of wet feeders.

Procedures

Two hundred finishing pigs were allotted by weight, litter, and sex to one of the following four treatments: A) Oval dry feeder (Osborne); B) Rectangular dry feeder (Pride of the Farm); C) Rectangular feeder (same as B) but equipped with a water manifold above the feeding troughs; D) Rectangular wet feeder (Aqua). In treatment C, the water manifold was the water source for the pen of pigs, and moistened the feed in the trough as the pigs drooled water. In treatment D, the nipple waterers required the pigs to moisten feed or create a pool of water to obtain water needs. There were 2 replications per treatment.

Pigs were housed (25 pigs/pen) in the KSU finishing barn. Pens were 12 X 15 ft. with 50% concrete slats and 50% solid concrete. The ration used for all four treatments was a fortified sorghum grain-soybean meal diet with a calculated analysis of 15.5% crude protein, .80% calcium, and .70% phosphorous.

Results and Discussion

Data presented in Table 1 show the performance of finishing pigs fed dry or wet diets. Pigs fed wet diets grew significantly faster ($P < .05$) and were more efficient than those fed the dry diets. Average daily feed intake was similar for all treatments. Feeder type did not alter the performance significantly, since those pigs receiving dry diets performed similarly whether fed with an oval feeder (Osborne) or a rectangular feeder (Pride of the Farm). Likewise, pigs fed with the Aqua feeder performed similarly to those fed with a Pride of the Farm feeder equipped with a water manifold.

Table 1. Performance of Finishing Pigs Fed Wet or Dry Diets.^c

Feeder	Pride Dry	Osborne Dry	Pride Wet	Aqua Wet
Initial wt., lbs.	104.3	105.5	104.2	102.9
Final wt., lbs.	236.3	236.0	240.6	242.9
ADG, lbs.	1.78 ^a	1.76 ^a	1.84 ^b	1.89 ^b
ADFI, lbs.	6.56	6.34	6.42	6.56
Feed/gain	3.68 ^a	3.60 ^{ab}	3.48 ^b	3.47 ^b

^{ab} Means on the same line with different superscripts differ significantly ($P < .05$).

^c 25 pigs/pen; 2 pens per treatment; 74 day trial.

